

Message

---

**From:** Hathaway, Margaret [Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 11/4/2020 5:50:01 PM  
**To:** Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Garrison, Scott [Garrison.Scott@epa.gov]; Lara, Rhina [Lara.Rhina@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Kenny, Daniel [Kenny.Dan@epa.gov]; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB

Thanks Ed. Rhina, HB can continue to work with you on updating the 24c guidance website, but it sounds like Ed's email about the public comment question gives you what you need to craft an answer to the media's question.

- Meg

---

**From:** Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 04, 2020 12:42 PM  
**To:** Hathaway, Margaret <Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov>; Garrison, Scott <Garrison.Scott@epa.gov>; Lara, Rhina <Lara.Rhina@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB

Correct that we are not approving more restrictive under 24© going forward and states can use other mechanisms.

## Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

---

Ed Messina, Esq.  
Acting Office Director  
Office of Pesticide Programs  
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Washington, D.C.  
p: (703) 347-0209

---

**From:** Hathaway, Margaret <Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 04, 2020 12:25 PM

**To:** Garrison, Scott <Garrison.Scott@epa.gov>; Lara, Rhina <Lara.Rhina@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>

**Cc:** Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>

**Subject:** RE: Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB

Thanks Scott for your insights on this.

Dans or Marietta, please correct me if I am wrong, but my understanding from what I've been told about RD's recent conversations with Alex Dunn is that going forward, EPA is not supposed to approve any 24cs that further restrict the federal Section 3 labels, regardless of the chemical(s) involved.

## Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

- Meg

---

**From:** Garrison, Scott <Garrison.Scott@epa.gov>

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 04, 2020 10:18 AM

**To:** Lara, Rhina <Lara.Rhina@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>

**Cc:** Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Hathaway, Margaret <Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov>; Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>

**Subject:** RE: Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB

Confidential communication for internal deliberations only. Attorney-client privilege. Do not distribute outside U.S. Government.

## Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) / Attorney-Client

# Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) / Attorney-Client

Scott Garrison  
Pesticides and Toxic Substances Law Office (2333A)  
Office of General Counsel  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
202-564-4047  
[garrison.scott@epa.gov](mailto:garrison.scott@epa.gov)

---

**From:** Lara, Rhina <[Lara.Rhina@epa.gov](mailto:Lara.Rhina@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 04, 2020 10:11 AM  
**To:** Messina, Edward <[Messina.Edward@epa.gov](mailto:Messina.Edward@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Rosenblatt, Daniel <[Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov)>; Garrison, Scott <[Garrison.Scott@epa.gov](mailto:Garrison.Scott@epa.gov)>; Hathaway, Margaret <[Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov](mailto:Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov)>; Kenny, Daniel <[Kenny.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Kenny.Dan@epa.gov)>; Echeverria, Marietta <[Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov](mailto:Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB  
**Importance:** High

Hi Ed,

I am looping you in to this discussion! We received a press inquiry regarding 24c and re-iterated the following from the dicamba registration decision:

FIFRA section 24(a) allows a state to regulate pesticides more restrictively than EPA under the state's own authority. However, some of the states that have imposed cut-off dates on dicamba uses have done so under section 24(c). Section 24(c) only authorizes states to issue registrations for additional uses of federal registrations to meet special local needs. Moving forward, if states wish to impose further restrictions on the dicamba products, or any other federally registered pesticides, they should do so under section 24(a) of FIFRA.

The reporter is asking for a more direct response to her questions below. Should we respond directly? From my understanding, we are not providing a formal comment period, although we do mention on this webpage that we would do so: <https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/guidance-fifra-24c-registrations>

1. Does the Tuesday dicamba registration decision and announcement re: FIFRA Section 24(c) mark an official change in EPA's position on states' use of Section 24(c)? And if so, has EPA decided to skip the public comment period it committed to on this topic in the spring of 2019?
2. Will this stance on 24c (no state restrictions, only expansions) be applied by EPA uniformly to all future state SLN labels on all pesticides, beyond dicamba?
3. Has EPA's position on this been prompted or influenced by the EPA's Inspector General investigation into states' use of Section 24(c)?

4. Via AAPCO, state regulators have directly petitioned EPA not to take this stance on Section 24(c), which will greatly limit states' ability to react quickly to new dicamba labels, given the cumbersome and time-consuming process of state rulemaking permitted via 24(a). Did EPA consult with state regulators or inform them of this new stance (no restrictions via 24 (c)) before the dicamba decision? Because the state regulators I have spoken to seem taken completely off guard by this announcement by their federal co-regulators.

Best,

**Rhina M. Lara** (*she/her/hers*)

Communications Branch

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Phone: (202) 815- 5722

---

**From:** Lara, Rhina

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 4, 2020 9:27 AM

**To:** Hathaway, Margaret <[Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov](mailto:Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov)>; Kenny, Daniel <[Kenny.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Kenny.Dan@epa.gov)>

**Cc:** Rosenblatt, Daniel <[Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov)>; Garrison, Scott <[Garrison.Scott@epa.gov](mailto:Garrison.Scott@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB

**Importance:** High

Hi, again,

The reporter followed up on her inquiry and feels we didn't answer her questions. She specifically asked:

What happened to the public comment period on EPA's 24(c) interpretation specifically promised by Rick Keigwin to state regulators via AAPCO last spring?

She also asked if we were able to directly answer any of the questions below?

I am assuming we cannot provide more information. Let me know if there is anything else we can say regarding 24c.

Best,

**Rhina M. Lara** (*she/her/hers*)

Communications Branch

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Phone: (202) 815- 5722

---

**From:** Hathaway, Margaret <[Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov](mailto:Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov)>

**Sent:** Monday, November 2, 2020 12:54 PM

**To:** Lara, Rhina <[Lara.Rhina@epa.gov](mailto:Lara.Rhina@epa.gov)>; Kenny, Daniel <[Kenny.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Kenny.Dan@epa.gov)>

**Cc:** Rosenblatt, Daniel <[Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov)>; Garrison, Scott <[Garrison.Scott@epa.gov](mailto:Garrison.Scott@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB

Hi Rhina:

Yes, please work with this text as the basis of EPA's responses.

Thank you,

Meg

---

**From:** Lara, Rhina <[Lara.Rhina@epa.gov](mailto:Lara.Rhina@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 02, 2020 9:03 AM  
**To:** Hathaway, Margaret <[Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov](mailto:Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov)>; Kenny, Daniel <[Kenny.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Kenny.Dan@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Rosenblatt, Daniel <[Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov)>; Garrison, Scott <[Garrison.Scott@epa.gov](mailto:Garrison.Scott@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB

Okay. Looping Scott in. I feel like we may not have specific answers to all of this reporter's questions. For example, I do see a FIFRA 24c memo coming up in December, but we have not started working on the comms for that just yet.

Here is some text straight from the registration decision document. Maybe we can respond with a variation of this?

FIFRA section 24(a) allows a state to regulate pesticides more restrictively than EPA under the state's own authority. However, some of the states that have imposed cut-off dates on dicamba uses have done so under section 24(c). Section 24(c) only authorizes states to issue registrations for additional uses of federal registrations to meet special local needs. Moving forward, if states wish to impose further restrictions on the dicamba products, or any other federally registered pesticides, they should do so under section 24(a) of FIFRA.

Best,  
**Rhina M. Lara** (*she/her/hers*)  
Communications Branch  
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Phone: (202) 815- 5722

---

**From:** Hathaway, Margaret <[Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov](mailto:Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 2, 2020 8:38 AM  
**To:** Lara, Rhina <[Lara.Rhina@epa.gov](mailto:Lara.Rhina@epa.gov)>; Kenny, Daniel <[Kenny.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Kenny.Dan@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Rosenblatt, Daniel <[Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB

Hi Rhina:

Marietta told me that she participated in a call with Alex Dunn last week in which Alex made it clear that going forward 24(c) is only appropriate for making the label more expansive and not for adding restrictions.

That is the only feedback I've received from my management on this topic.

Margaret Hathaway (Meg)  
Senior Regulatory Specialist  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
OCSPP: Office of Pesticide Programs  
Registration Division – Herbicide Branch  
[hathaway.margaret@epa.gov](mailto:hathaway.margaret@epa.gov)  
(703) 305-5076

---

**From:** Lara, Rhina <[Lara.Rhina@epa.gov](mailto:Lara.Rhina@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 02, 2020 8:28 AM  
**To:** Kenny, Daniel <[Kenny.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Kenny.Dan@epa.gov)>; Hathaway, Margaret <[Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov](mailto:Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Rosenblatt, Daniel <[Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB

**Importance:** High

Good Morning,

Circling back on this press inquiry. Do we have enough information to work on a response? We can run the response by Michele later today, once we have it drafted. Here are the questions:

1. Does the Tuesday dicamba registration decision and announcement re: FIFRA Section 24(c) mark an official change in EPA's position on states' use of Section 24(c)? And if so, has EPA decided to skip the public comment period it committed to on this topic in the spring of 2019?
2. Will this stance on 24c (no state restrictions, only expansions) be applied by EPA uniformly to all future state SLN labels on all pesticides, beyond dicamba?
3. Has EPA's position on this been prompted or influenced by the EPA's Inspector General investigation into states' use of Section 24(c)?
4. Via AAPCO, state regulators have directly petitioned EPA not to take this stance on Section 24(c), which will greatly limit states' ability to react quickly to new dicamba labels, given the cumbersome and time-consuming process of state rulemaking permitted via 24(a). Did EPA consult with state regulators or inform them of this new stance (no restrictions via 24 (c)) before the dicamba decision? Because the state regulators I have spoken to seem taken completely off guard by this announcement by their federal co-regulators.

Best,

**Rhina M. Lara** (*she/her/hers*)

Communications Branch

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Phone: (202) 815- 5722

---

**From:** Kenny, Daniel <[Kenny.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Kenny.Dan@epa.gov)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2020 10:32 AM

**To:** Lara, Rhina <[Lara.Rhina@epa.gov](mailto:Lara.Rhina@epa.gov)>; Hathaway, Margaret <[Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov](mailto:Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov)>

**Cc:** Rosenblatt, Daniel <[Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB

This is a tricky one. I'm looping in Dan R, because I think he's more up to date on the 24(c) issue. We will probably also need to loop in OGC (Michele Knorr).

---

**From:** Lara, Rhina <[Lara.Rhina@epa.gov](mailto:Lara.Rhina@epa.gov)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2020 10:03 AM

**To:** Hathaway, Margaret <[Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov](mailto:Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov)>

**Cc:** Kenny, Daniel <[Kenny.Dan@epa.gov](mailto:Kenny.Dan@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** Press Inquiry - Dicamba - DDL 10/29 COB

**Importance:** High

Hi Dan and Meg,

We got this one from Progressive Farmer. Unfortunately, I am not up to speed on where we left off regarding Section 24© (I know there were some updates recently), so I am sorry for not taking a crack at a response for these.

1. Does the Tuesday dicamba registration decision and announcement re: FIFRA Section 24(c) mark an official change in EPA's position on states' use of Section 24(c)? And if so, has EPA decided to skip the public comment period it committed to on this topic in the spring of 2019?
2. Will this stance on 24c (no state restrictions, only expansions) be applied by EPA uniformly to all future state SLN labels on all pesticides, beyond dicamba?
3. Has EPA's position on this been prompted or influenced by the EPA's Inspector General investigation into states' use of Section 24(c)?
4. Via AAPCO, state regulators have directly petitioned EPA not to take this stance on Section 24(c), which will greatly limit states' ability to react quickly to new dicamba labels, given the cumbersome and time-consuming process of state rulemaking permitted via 24(a). Did EPA consult with state regulators or inform them of this new stance (no restrictions via 24 (c)) before the dicamba decision? Because the state regulators I have spoken to seem taken completely off guard by this announcement by their federal co-regulators.

Best,

**Rhina M. Lara** (*she/her/hers*)

Communications Branch

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Phone: (202) 815- 5722